

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration. Claims 1-39 and 41-47 are pending for examination with claims 1, 14, 27 and 41 being independent claims. No new matter has been added. In the Amendments and remarks below, Applicants have addressed the issues raised in the Final Rejection of January 3, 2007.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1, 14, 27 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. As understood, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112 reflects the Examiner's concern that "directly" and "without the assistance of a server" do not accurately describe operation of a peer-to-peer collaboration system. Applicants propose to overcome this rejection by eliminating the objectionable phrases from the claim and reciting more directly a peer-to-peer collaboration system.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 14, 27 and 41 under 35 U.S.C. §112 is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-5, 11, 13-18, 24, 26-31, 37, 39 and 41-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Henrick et al, U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2003/0041108. Applicant respectfully disagree.

As described in more detail in a prior response filed October 28, 2006, the present application describes a peer-to-peer collaboration system. Such systems did not have a convenient, centralized mechanism to provide management functions. The application describes how such a system could be provided with a management server that can interact with client software of the peer-to-peer collaboration system to implement managed entities that can exchange management information with the server.

The Examiner asserts that Henrick at paragraphs 29-31 discloses such a system. However, that passage describes users connecting to a server and downloading a software

component 115. The software component 115 is client software that allows a user to connect to a collaboration session. However, Henrick describes a peer-to-peer collaborative web browsing system and has no management server that performs management functions as described in the present application. As a result, there are multiple differences between each claim and the system in the reference.

As for claim 1, no part of Henrick teaches or suggests a management server or “sending a request from a management server,” as recited in the claim. In Henrick, clients request the software and do not receive a request from the server.

Further, no part of the reference teaches or suggests “downloading from the management server...a definition file containing a definition of the managed entity,” as recited in the claim. There is no basis for interpreting the software component 115 of Henrick as a definition file containing a definition of a managed entity. Client software, such as software component 115, is not the same as a definition file defining a managed entity. Further, element c) recites that the definition file is downloaded “*to* the client software.” Downloading the client software as described in the reference cannot be the same as downloading a definition file *to* the client software and the reference cannot teach or suggest this limitation.

There are yet further differences between claim 1 and the reference. Because no definition file is downloaded in the system of Henrick, steps of the claim, such as those reciting “associating information in the definition file with the first user identity and device information...to create the managed entity,” are not met by the reference.

Further, the management server in the present application provides a function that is very different than the server in Henrick that supplies client software. The present application describes that the management server exchanges information about the operation of the entities in the collaboration system as part of a peer-to-peer collaboration sessions [0013 of the application as published]. The server in Henrick does not perform any similar management function and does not teach or suggest “interacting between the management server and the client software to exchange information associated with the operation of the managed entity in the peer-to-peer collaboration session separately from the collaboration information exchange between the first user and the second user,” as claimed.

Other claims similarly distinguish the reference. Claim 14 recites both “client software” and “management software that sends a request from a management server...to become a managed entity.” However, there is no indication in Henrick that the server sends a request to a user to become a managed entity.

Further, because the system in Henrick downloads client software, not a definition file, the reference has no “download manager that downloads from the management server to the client software a definition file containing a definition of the managed entity,” as claimed. Because there is no definition file, there is also no “mechanism in the client software that associates the definition information with the first user identity or device information operating in the first device in order to create a managed entity.”

Because no managed entity is created in the system of Henrick, the reference also does not teach or suggest “a mechanism that exchanges information relating to the managed entity between the client software and the management software,” as claimed. It of course follows that the reference does not teach or suggestion the limitations of claim 14 that more specifically defines the type of management information exchanged. Accordingly, there is no teaching or suggestion of “information relating to monitoring operation of the managed entity...,” as claimed.

The peer-to-peer collaborative web browsing system of Henrick also does not teach or suggest all limitations of claim 27. For example, Claim 27 recites “program code for receiving a request from a management server to the first user to become a managed entity.” No corresponding request occurs in the system of Henrick.

Further, there is no “program code for downloading from the management server to client software a definition file containing a definition of the managed entity.” The software component 115 transferred in Henrick is not a definition file as recited in the claim and there is no program code that downloads a definition file from a management server to client software.

Because there is no definition file downloaded, there is no “program code for associating information in the definition file with the first user identity or device information in the client software in order to create the managed entity.” Because there is no definition file and therefore no managed entity, there can be no “program code for interacting with the management server to exchange information relating to the managed

entity within a collaboration session using the shared space.” Thus, for multiple reasons, Henrick does not teach or suggest all limitations of claim 27.

As to claim 41, the peer-to-peer collaborative web browsing system of Henrick does not teach or suggest the apparatus for managing a peer-to-peer collaboration system recited in claim 41. For example, there is no means for sending a request from a management server to the first user to become a managed entity,” as recited in claim 41. Further, the software component 115 referenced in Henrick is not “a definition file” as recited in the claim. Therefore, there is no means for downloading from the management server to client software a definition file.” Because there is no definition file downloaded in the system of Henrick, the reference does not meet the limitation reciting: “means in the client software for associating the definition of the managed entity with the first user identity and device information in the client software in order to create the managed entity.” As a result, no managed entity is created and there can be no “means for exchanging management information associated with the managed entity, the management information relating to the collaboration session, the management information being exchanged between the client software and the management server.” Thus, for multiple reasons, Henrick does not teach or suggest all limitations of claim 41.

The remaining claims depend directly or indirectly from one of the independent claims. The dependent claims should be allowed for at least the reasons given above in connection with the independent claims. The dependent claims recite limitations that further distinguish the references. Accordingly, the rejections of the dependent claims should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at the telephone number listed below if this communication does not place the case in condition for allowance.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicant hereby requests any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 23/2825.

Dated: April 25, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Edmund J. Walsh
Reg. No. 32,950
Wolf, Greenfield & Sacks, P.C.
600 Atlantic Avenue
Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2206
Telephone: (617) 646-8000